



#5

PATENT**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE****In re Application of:****Ochoa et al.****Serial No.: 09/940,010****Filed: August 27, 2001****For: SEMICONDUCTOR INTEGRATED
CIRCUIT HAVING COMPRESSION
CIRCUITRY FOR COMPRESSING TEST
DATA, AND THE TEST SYSTEM AND
METHOD FOR UTILIZING THE
SEMICONDUCTOR INTEGRATED
CIRCUIT****Confirmation No.: 3702****Examiner: S. Chase****Group Art Unit: 2133****Attorney Docket No.: 3011.3US
(92-0657.4)****Notice of Allowance Mailed:****September 10, 2002****NOTICE OF EXPRESS MAILING****Express Mail Mailing Label Number: EV209816220US****Date of Deposit with USPS: December 3, 2002****Person making Deposit: Matthew Wooton****COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE****Box ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231****Sir:**

**Applicants agree with the Examiner's statement that "the prior arts of record taken alone
or in combination discloses various methods of testing a semiconductor integrated circuit**

utilizing a testing device and an interface circuit; however the prior art of record fail to teach the novel elements of the instant invention.”

However, Applicants note that some of the Examiner’s reasons for allowance, with respect to statements made regarding specific claims, do not precisely track the claim language therein.

For example, with respect to claims 1 and 2, Applicants note that the load board interface does not itself include a plurality of input/output nodes as suggested by the Examiner. Rather, claim 1 recites that the plurality of sets of interface nodes of the load board interface are “configured to connect to corresponding input/output nodes of a semiconductor circuit.” Further, claim 2 simply recites that the each set of the interface nodes of the load board interface are “configured for electrical coupling with an individual semiconductor integrated circuit.”

Additionally, with respect to claim 6, it is noted that the claim recites “*at least one*” test station and “*at least one*” load board interface.

Applicants further submit that, while the dependent claims are allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim, such claims may also include subject matter which further defines over the prior art of record. Thus, Applicants submit that the scope of each individual claim is to be determined on its own merits based on the literal language set forth therein and equivalents thereof.

Respectfully submitted,



Bradley B. Jensen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,801
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110
(801) 532-1922

Date: December 3, 2002

BBJ/hlg:djp

N:\2269\3011.3\comments on reasons for allowance.wpd